

Cambria, 9-10-2015

Dear Hearing Officer:
RE: DRC2014-00158 Bailey
MUP Hearing Sep. 18, 2015.

This letter is in response to an MUP waver request of the established Vacation Rental Ordinance in Cambria and Cayucos, scheduled for September-18-2015 on a location at 333 Drake Street in Cambria.

My name is Martin Verhaegh of Cambria and recent surgery of my wife Joan, as well as my mobility at age 88, keep me from being personally present at this meeting. It's particularly affecting us because I initiated the ordinance through the Grand Jury in 1997. Again, we want to express our thanks to our former Supervisor Shirley Bianchi for her support and guidance during the 5 year formation of the ordinance. I am sure the other 550 active formation residents of Cambria and Cayucos agree also.

I would like to point out that the long ordinance formation time period was at an extreme disadvantage to the people living in the residential districts. It allowed concentrations of closely spaced Vacation Rentals establishment in our residential communities. All those deviating spacing locations were Grandfathered into the ordinance, under protests of the residents.

In view of the many unfairly established deviating locations bothering the residents now, creating more exceptions would appear to be additional punishment of so many residents. A large number of residents who took time out from their busy schedules to come before County Offices over all those years to protect their Quality of Life. As well as before the continuing Local District Council meetings to assure protection of the established Vacation Rental Ordinance.

In previous challenges of the ordinance through an MUP, we were able to convince County Government to turn down the requestor. This current zoning challenge (commercial versus residential) would appear to be the key move by those with no concern to our Quality of our Life in residential districts, and aimed at destroying the Vacation Rental Ordinance. It is called a Minor Use Permit, but to local residents it looms as a Major Problem.

The location in question already has 2 rentals in close vicinity, and allowing an additional rental violates the Vacation Rental Ordinance. Our Quality of Life has been suffering enough over all those years, and granting any MUP waver to the Vacation Rental Ordinance conditions for the resident is out of line. Particularly, in view of one person's financial gains versus so many suffering residential residents.

There is a Zoning Limit to the encroachment of Commercial Business into our Residential Districts, and with Vacation Rentals, Bed-and-Breakfast and Home Stays, that limit has been reached a long time ago. And yes, all these businesses are space limited within the Vacation Rental Ordinance specifications.

Each individual has to honestly ask the question: what are the conditions acceptable to one's own family while living in a Single Family Residentially Zoned district.
Please reject the MUP waver request!!

Sincerely, Martin and Joan Verhaegh, Cambria.

cc. Supervisor Bruce Gibson.



Fw: Request for Hearing - Case No: DRC2014-00158 Bailey

Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/11/2015 08:19 AM

Hi Nicole,

FYI: Can you also forward to hearing officer?

Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/11/2015 08:18 AM -----

From: "David Marshall" <dnmarshall@charter.net>
To: "Cody Scheel" <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "Brian Glusovich" <glus@charter.net>, <coastgazer@aol.com>
Date: 09/10/2015 04:22 PM
Subject: Request for Hearing - Case No: DRC2014-00158 Bailey

I request a hearing for Case No. DRC2014-00158 Bailey, Coastal E-Referral, MUP, Cambria regarding the application for a MUP to operate a vacation rental at 313 Drake, Cambria.

As matter of background, I've owned my residence at 2401 Windsor, Cambria, since 1992. For the most part, I think its safe to say that vacation rentals have adversely impacted permanent residents due the nature of the occupancy. This fact led to the current Ordinance which attempts to control the impacts by regulating the intensity of vacation rentals within a given area. Currently, I believe there are 6 licensed vacation rentals (3 on Olando, 1 on Windsor, and 2 on Castle) within 200 feet of my home. I have felt the impacts (late night arrivals, late night partying, hot tubs, loud music, exterior lighting, etc., etc.). It is my understanding that only one licensed vaction rental is permitted by Ordinance within a specific distance of an existing vacation rental, but several of the current rentals were "grandfathered in". I'm not objecting to any of the current rentals, as some of them predated my ownership. However, given the intensity of the existing vacation rentals in the area, I don't understand why the County would consider approving this MUP which is in direct conflct with the intent and specific requirements of the Ordinance.

I know there other neighbors in the area who feel as strongly as I do about this issue, but were not apparently in the area covered by the County's MUP notification. They will also be interested in the County's position on this matter, as it is only a matter of time when they will be impacted by a future MUP on their street.

Thank you for considering this request.

David N. Marshall
2401 Windsor Boulevard
Cambria, CA, 93428



Fw: protesting Minor Use Permit
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/11/2015 08:22 AM

FYI: again!!!

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/11/2015 08:22 AM -----

From: masherry9445@comcast.net
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/10/2015 08:28 PM
Subject: protesting Minor Use Permit

I am a property owner in Cambria of a home at 353 Drake St. and adjacent lots at 365 Drake.

This letter is regarding (and in protest of) County File Number DRC2014-00158 - Assessor parcel number 023-045-039 - Supervisorial District 2

I received a form letter from SLO County that property at 313 Drake St. is being considered as a vacation rental. This seems like a rezoning issue to me, as it modifies Coastal Land Use Ordinance Section 23.08.165(C)(1) which restricts new vacation rentals to 150-200 feet from existing vacation rentals.

This would change that to 50 feet from an existing vacation rental. I wish to register a protest as a neighbor to that dwelling.

The coastal traffic is increasing and with other vacation rentals (some perhaps without permits, I don't know) in the immediate neighborhood, the quiet residential nature of the guaranteed zoning of Drake St. is being violated.

Please consider this a **STRONG PROTEST** to the approval of 313 Drake as a vacation rental. On behalf of the neighbors **PLEASE DENY** this request.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon L. Lydon
720-218-2432 (cell)
303-526-1952 (home)



Fw: DRC2014-00158 Bailey hearing sep. 18
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/11/2015 12:53 PM

FYI: Thanks again!

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/11/2015 12:52 PM -----

From: joe and barb crowley <jcrowley_1@charter.net>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/11/2015 12:09 PM
Subject: DRC2014-00158 Bailey hearing sep. 18

DRC2014-00158 Bailey (please forward to hearing officer)

I am opposed to granting a MUP approval for 313 Drake, Cambria to operate a vacation rental. The Ordinance, (Nov. 2013) clearly states the distance requirements of 200 linear ft. same side of street, 200 linear feet on opposite side of street, and 150 ft. radius around the vacation rental. There are currently 2 licensed vacation rentals in the 150 ft. radius. This would add a third rental in that 150 ft radius. The North Coast Advisory Council voted to deny the MUP for this vacation rental license (August, 2015).

The purpose of the location clause of the Ordinance, (Nov. 2013) was to spread vacation rentals out so they would balance the problematic issues of tourism needs and residents' rights. The Board of Supervisors state in the adoption of these standards, "residential vacation rentals have the potential to be incompatible with surrounding residential uses, especially when several are concentrated in the same area, thereby having the potential for a deleterious effect on the adjacent full time residents. Special regulation of vacation rentals is necessary to ensure that they will be compatible with surrounding residential uses and will not harm and alter neighborhoods they are located within."

Additionally, the county is not enforcing violations, especially noise, parking, noticing nearby residents of vacation rentals, to name a few. One more vacation rental in the 150 ft radius, for a total of 3, would only add to the problem, cause more traffic, cause access issues for fire engines on such a narrow street, and defeat the purpose of the Ordinance as stated above.

Please support the Ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors, Coastal Commission, North Coast Advisory Council.

Deny the MUP for this property to obtain a vacation rental license.

Thank you for your consideration.
Barbara Crowley



please forward to hearing officer for DRC2014-00158, Friday Sept. 18th

to:

cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

09/11/2015 11:45 AM

Hide Details

From:

To: "cscheel@co.slo.ca.us" <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>

Please grant their application! I support having more vacation rentals in Cambria, they help the economy! They spend money in town & vacation rentals bring up property values!

Most of the people objecting to this are retired. They already have their incomes established. Vacation renters are for the most part respectful. They come during the busy season and are gone again. I for one enjoy having part time residents around me, most of the time, no one is there. Whine, whine whine, I'll bet all of the people are of the "less government" type, and what are they asking for, **more governing & more property laws**, but only when it is next door! **Stand up to these people who have nothing better to do than whine about people having a good time. Please grant their application!** Please keep my name out of the record, these old farts are vindictive.



Fw: DRC2014-00158
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/11/2015 02:43 PM

FYI:

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/11/2015 02:43 PM -----

From: James Shepherd <j2shep@gmail.com>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/11/2015 02:39 PM
Subject: DRC2014-00158

Cody Scheel,

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the meeting concerning DRC2014-00158, Bailey Family Revocable Trust request for a Minor Use Permit/Coastal Development Permit to allow an existing single family residence to be used as a residential vacation rental but I would like to request a hearing on this matter.

I disagree with the staff recommendation. The request is for a variance to the applicable ordinances and is not consistent with the San Luis Obispo County General Plan. Said plan does not allow the location of new vacation rentals when other rentals are in close proximity. To grant an exception because there are other, pre-existing rentals makes the original plan worthless. The ordinance that allows the application of such requests does not specify under what circumstances waivers to the General plan will be accepted or rejected and as such all requests for vacation rental variances should be rejected until such time as the ordinance can be amended to clarify under what circumstances vacation rental variances will be accepted.

We already have enough vacation rentals which are commercial enterprises and are not consistent with the sense of community within a single family zoned area. I am right next to two vacation rental units, one of which has apparently transitioned to a long term rental - the current tenant has been in residence for over two years. As far as filing complaints - I have not done so even though the persons at one unit routinely smoke me out with their barbeque and the long term tenant of the other unit installed a hot tub that, before the water restrictions, came on at about 4AM disturbing my sleep. If I had the contact information I would have contacted the responsible persons to seek noise and air quality remediation.

In closing, the continued conversion of single family residences into short term commercial vacation rentals is not good for the community. It reduces the number of dwellings available for permanent residents and long term renters. It disturbs the normal sense of community and potentially increases the chances for crime (since we can never tell who is supposed to be in a particular residence).

Respectfully,
James Shepherd
325 Emmons Rd
Cambria, CA 93428
(805) 927-2835



**Fw: Please forward to the Hearing Officer - DRC2014-00158,
Friday Sept. 18th**
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/14/2015 08:19 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/14/2015 08:18 AM -----

From: Bill Hughes <wmhughes@charter.net>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/11/2015 04:37 PM
Subject: Please forward to the Hearing Officer - DRC2014-00158, Friday Sept. 18th

SLO County Planning Commission

Re: Opposition to MUP 313 Drake St., Cambria

Attention Hearing Officer - DRC2014-00158, Sept. 18, 2015

I am writing in opposition to issuing or approving a vacation rental license through a variance procedure of a Minor Use Permit to 313 Drake in Cambria. The property at 313 Drake currently has 2 existing vacation rentals operating within a 150 ft. radius of its property lines. The location standard of the SLOCVRO clearly states that there shall not be another vacation rental within 200 linear feet on the same block and within 150 ft. radius across the street. Approving this variance would significantly increase the density of vacation rentals in this residential neighborhood and severely affect the character of this residential neighborhood.

The original intent of the MUP in the location standard of the SLOCVRO was not to allow an applicant a free pass to circumvent the ordinance to obtain a vacation rental license. The MUP variance was intended to cover unforeseen non-standard location instances. To use the minor use permit to circumvent the location standard in this case is clearly an abuse of the Minor Use Permit process.

The location standard of the SLOCVRO is the backbone to preserve the character of residential R-1 neighborhoods in Cambria. Since it's inception a MUP has not been approved to get relief from the location standard requirements of the ordinance. I strongly urge you to deny this MUP.

Respectfully,

William Hughes

434 Plymouth Street

Cambria, CA 93428

Tel 805.927.2535



SLOCPC-313_Drake.docx



Fw: DRC2014=00158
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/14/2015 08:21 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/14/2015 08:21 AM -----

From: "Art" <artedis@charter.net>
To: <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 09/12/2015 09:02 AM
Subject: DRC2014=00158

Please forward to hearing officer for DRC2014=00158.

Mr. Scheel,

Due to prior doctor's appointment, I cannot make this hearing.

I oppose the DRC2014-00158 for 313 Drake, Cambria, Ca 93428

Please enforce the vacation ordinance that you have on the books. The North Coast Advisory Council, after considering local input recommended that this MUP NOT be approve!

Thank you,

William A. Edis
629 Ardath Dr.,
Cambria, Ca 93428

SLO County Planning Commission
Re: Opposition to MUP 313 Drake St., Cambria

Attention Hearing Officer - DRC2014-00158, Sept. 18, 2015

I am writing in opposition to issuing or approving a vacation rental license through a variance procedure of a Minor Use Permit to 313 Drake in Cambria. The property at 313 Drake currently has 2 existing vacation rentals operating within a 150 ft. radius of its property lines. The location standard of the SLOCVRO clearly states that there shall not be another vacation rental within 200 linear feet on the same block and within 150 ft. radius across the street. Approving this variance would significantly increase the density of vacation rentals in this residential neighborhood and severely affect the character of this residential neighborhood.

The original intent of the MUP in the location standard of the SLOCVRO was not to allow an applicant a free pass to circumvent the ordinance to obtain a vacation rental license. The MUP variance was intended to cover unforeseen non-standard location instances. To use the minor use permit to circumvent the location standard in this case is clearly an abuse of the Minor Use Permit process.

The location standard of the SLOCVRO is the backbone to preserve the character of residential R-1 neighborhoods in Cambria. Since its inception a MUP has not been approved to get relief from the location standard requirements of the ordinance. I strongly urge you to deny this MUP.

Respectfully,

William Hughes
434 Plymouth Street
Cambria, CA 93428
Tel 805.927.2535



Fw: comments for hearing officer of MUP 313 Drake Sep. 18

Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/14/2015 08:25 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/14/2015 08:25 AM -----

From: joe and barb crowley <jcrowley_1@charter.net>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/12/2015 02:53 PM
Subject: comments for hearing officer of MUP 313 Drake Sep. 18

Dear Cody,

Please pass this on to the hearing officer. You have this already for a request for a hearing but it's not on the site for the hearing officer and the person asked me to read it at the hearing or do anything I want with it. I am using it as comment letter to the hearing officer.

Start comment:

My MAIN concern is the increased traffic that another vacation rental will cause on Drake Street. My plea to the county for stop signs (4-way OR 2-way) at two dangerous intersections resulted in no action. I have witnessed several near accidents at Drake and Marlborough and Drake and Windsor!

Cars and trucks speed up and down Drake Street all day long. There are no posted speed limit signs. Many tourists think that they are still driving on Highway 1. Several times a week, someone will ask me for directions to Moonstone Beach, the elephant seals, and Hearst Castle! There are no signs BEFORE the intersection of Ardath and Main at Highway 1 that provide mileage information or directions to tourists. Cars make the left at Ardath and keep driving down towards the ocean, trying to follow the streets all the way up the coast.

Other concerns are:

- Full trash and recycle cans left outside for more than one night
- Front and back porch, garage door, and outside lights being left on all night long
- Loud noise and music after 11:00 p.m.
- Cars being parked at the curb on our narrow streets could mean no access for fire trucks or emergency vehicles! As you know many vacation rentals do not allow the renters to park inside a garage so the renters have to park their cars in the driveway. When the driveway is full, extra cars are parked on the street!

You may be interested to know that the following addresses near me are currently being used as "rentals":

334 Castle - Active Vacation Rental

320 Drake - Active Vacation Rental (Now being rented as a long term rental.)
2299 Marlborough - Active Vacation Rental
351 Drake - Unlicensed Vacation Rental
353 Drake - Long Term Rental (Four different tenants in six years, all used the one-car garage for storage and parked two or more cars outside.)
2295 Windsor - Licensed Vacation Rental or Unlicensed Vacation Rental

Besides the above list. How many Airbnbs do we now have in Cambria?

Thank you for all your help in this matter!

Judy Martinez
358 Drake Street
judy@jontronics.com



Fw: MUP 313 Drake
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/14/2015 08:27 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/14/2015 08:27 AM -----

From: Joyce Renshaw <jrenshaw@me.com>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/13/2015 08:21 AM
Subject: MUP 313 Drake

Along with other residents of Cambria, I oppose granting a MUP for 313 Drake, to operate a vacation rental business because:

1. There are already 2 licensed vacations rentals nearby, while only 1 would be allowed under the VR ordinance.
2. Enforcement of day-to-day violations of the VR ordinance, such as noise and parking, continues to be difficult and/or non-existent. With our narrow streets, parking on the streets and increased traffic, it presents a dangerous threat for fire emergency.
3. The only effective way to mitigate disturbances to the neighborhood is to honor the location limitations of the VR Ordinance.
4. The North Coast Advisory Council, after considering local input, recommended that this MUP not be approved.

When I was Chair of NCAC a few years back, we worked very hard to get this Vacation Rental Ordinance passed.

It is very disappointing to see that it is not being enforced by the County. I know we need vacation rentals but we don't need three close to each other. We need to uphold the 150 foot radius.

Sincerely,
Joyce Renshaw
1790 Ogden Dr
Cambria, CA



forward to Hearing Officer for Sep 18 hearing DRC2014-00158

to:

cscheel

09/14/2015 12:18 PM

Hide Details

From:

harter.net>

To: <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>

The right decision has been made. Please stop listening to these old farts. Vacation rentals bring money to the area, they actually make property rates increase because owners have the ability to **use their property as they see fit**, whether it is for their own personal use or as an income producing unit. Typical buyers have the flexibility to rent out their homes on a part time basis and still use them when they want. They can also rent them out as vacation rentals, providing income to pay the mortgage for an less encumbered property upon retirement. Taking away an owner's right to use their property as they see fit, reduces market appeal, which has a negative effect on values. A buyer who wishes to buy a home here, rent it out part time, use it once in while and eventually move into it in their golden years, will simply buy in Morro Bay or Pismo. Quit making Cambria's market appeal, well, simply less appealing. **Please keep my name confidential. It's a small town & these people can be vindictive.** Sincerely



Fw: REQUEST TO DENY PERMIT
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/14/2015 08:31 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/14/2015 08:31 AM -----

From: Margol Roberts <kenandmargol@charter.net>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us, Bruce Gibson <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 09/13/2015 09:01 AM
Subject: REQUEST TO DENY PERMIT

PLEASE FORWARD THIS EMAIL TO THE HEARING OFFICER FOR DRC2014-00158
FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015.

We are requesting that the MUP for a Vacation Rental at 313 Drake be denied. The ordinance clearly states the number of feet between and across the street from residences. Another rental here would mean more noise, cars, partying and inability for the permanent full time residents to enjoy their life.

We currently have approximately 15 rentals within 500 feet of our home in Marine Terrace on Marlborough. This is the result of grandfathering rentals when the code was put into effect. We have had considerable problems for over 15 years. Continuously calling the rental agencies always seem to side with the renters and don't believe us.

Attached is a photo taken at 8 AM on Sunday, May 31, 2015. This address is 1815 Marlborough Lane within 100 feet of our property. I thought that there were 11 vehicles. When I downloaded my photo I actually counted 14 vehicles. This is just one of many photos that I have taken. This is outrageous. I talked to the owner of the property when I saw him visit shortly after and he was shocked to say the least. He only allows 6 guests even though there are three bedrooms. He provided me with his home phone number and asked me to call if we ever had any more problems. This clearly is not my job. We have observed 6 - 8 cars and on three occasions RV's hook up to this house and park in the adjacent lot.

We have also taken photos over the years of excessive number of vehicles parked in the roadway at this rental 1815 Marlborough as well as 1868 Marlborough next door to us next door.

The noise from the parties on weekends, holidays and summer vacations is a public nuisance. The county requires code enforcement observation in order to issue a violation. However, no one from county enforcement works after 5 PM, on the weekends or holidays.

I have been advised over and over again by Supervisor Bruce Gibson to call the sheriff. I feel that they have better things to tend to than come out and quiet a party, tag cars parked in the roadway or even enter

a property to see excessive number of tenants.

Trash is also a concern. Within the last month at the property next door there was so much trash left that the cans were not emptied.

PLEASE HELP THE LOCAL PERMANENT RESIDENTS ENJOY OUR LIVING HERE BY DENYING THIS PERMIT.

Margol and Ken Roberts
805 927-0841

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<http://www.avast.com>



DSC00472.jpg





Fw: Request for Vacation Rental
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/15/2015 08:15 AM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/15/2015 08:15 AM -----

From: "Jess and Pat" <jnpbath@charter.net>
To: <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: <jcrowley_1@charter.net>
Date: 09/14/2015 09:21 PM
Subject: Request for Vacation Rental

please forward to Hearing Officer for Sep 18 hearing DRC2014-00158

This e-mail is a request to deny approval of a vacation rental for 313 Drake St., Cambria for the following reasons:

1. My experience with a vacation rental in my neighborhood is that they change the character of the area thru excessive noise, multiple vehicular parking and traffic.
2. a. The county findings that vacation rentals do not generate more traffic than a single family residence is incorrect since most vacation rentals have multiple visitors creating much more traffic and parking problems.
2. b. Existing vacation rentals have been operating without code enforcement cases frequently happens because the rental managers are not available to lodge complaints with.
2. c. This proposed license does not meet land use standards because it violates the location standard and the spirit of the Ordinance. I see this action as an attempt to circumvent the Ordinance and allow motel type density into single family neighborhoods; an inappropriate action.

Jess W, Bathke,
399 Lampton St.
Cambria, Ca.



Fw: Oppose MUP at 313 Drake / CAMBRIA
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/15/2015 02:07 PM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/15/2015 02:07 PM -----

From: Carol Glusovich <cglusovich@gmail.com>
To: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 09/15/2015 02:03 PM
Subject: Oppose MUP at 313 Drake / CAMBRIA

To Cody Scheel :

Please give this input to the Hearing Officer for Friday, Sept 18

Re: DRC2014-00158

RE: MUP for 313 Drake / oppose granting

On our short street, ATWELL , we have only 36 single lots facing Atwell St. On the south , 18 lots / on the north, 18 lots. (25' lots × 18 = 450' / distance along the street, from top of 1st house facing Atwell to the bottom)

On the south side are 7 homes....

(2 houses are Vacation Rentals).

On the north side are 4 homes.....

(1 house is a Vacation Rental + 1 house has the option to be a Vacation Rental).

Through our 25 years of living here on ATWELL St. we have watched the changes to the neighborhood.

Before the ORDINANCE was passed we experienced a lot of problems with the short term visitors. And no one to call after 5 pm.

Now , after the ORDINANCE, it appears most visitors are better instructed by the Rental Agency to treat the residents with more respect. There has been a big difference in noise and parking. There are exceptions.....the people who disregard what the rental agency has told them OR the paper they have signed about rules.....and now we have an After Hours Phone Number to call . (Not all the residents have been given this after hours #.....rental agencies could do better giving that # out!)

This summer a group blatantly disregarded the Ordinance . (an engagement party with cars parked on both sides of Atwell and with 20 -30 people out on the front deck).

I did not notify the COUNTY.

From now on I will notify the COUNTY because I heard that the COUNTY is saying that they have had no complaints!

Perhaps it is because we notify the RENTAL AGENCY?

NOW I will notify the COUNTY every time I find I need to call the rental people.

MY mistake.....

The COUNTY will hear from me now, when visitors do cause problems.

And I am going to advise my neighbors and friends to place

cscheel@co.slo.ca.us.

in their Smart Phones so that Cody DOES get notified of complaints.

Please follow the ORDINANCE.

Say NO to allowing another vacation rental in Cambria.

Regards,

Carol Glusovich

351 Atwell St.

927-5758

Kathleen Preciado
370 Ivar Street
Cambria, CA 93428-4455
805/924-1312
kpreciado@charter.net

September 16, 2015

Matt Janssen, Hearing Officer
San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission
Via email to Cody Scheel, planner: cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
RE: DRC2014-00158, item to be heard on Friday, September 18, 2015

Along with other residents of Cambria, I oppose granting a Minor Use Permit for 313 Drake, to operate a vacation rental business because:

[1] Two licensed vacations rentals are nearby, while only one is allowed under the county's vacation rental (VR) ordinance.

[2] Enforcement of violations of the VR ordinance, especially related to noise and parking, continues to be problematic. Increased street parking and traffic caused by an additional vacation rental in the neighborhood will hamper emergency access, especially on the narrow roadways of Marine Terrace. Since there is no space for street parking (see photos below), cars will undoubtedly be parked on nearby empty lots.



I live on Marine Terrace, where there are many vacation rentals. As you know, this was an unusually warm summer, and at night noise carries. Usually it's a pleasant noise---the sound of the ocean---but when it is a crowd yelling loudly in the middle of the night, it is very unpleasant. I do not have ready access to a contact person for the dozens of nearby vacation rentals and I suspect that some houses are rented short-term and are not registered with the county. In the middle of the night I do not want to make a telephone call to the police regarding noisy disturbances when I'm not sure who is responsible for the noise nor do I want to get dressed and prowl the neighborhood in the dark to look for the noisemakers.

[3] The only effective way to mitigate disturbances to the neighborhood is to honor the location limitations of the VR ordinance. Much time and effort were required to finalize the residential vacation ordinance. I do not understand why the planning commission is not implementing the clearly written ordinance requiring that “no residential vacation rental shall be located within: (1) 200 linear feet of a parcel and on the same side of the street as the vacation rental; (2) 200 linear feet of the parcel on the opposite side of the street from the vacation rental; and (3) 150 foot radius around the vacation rental.” Just because, according to county planning department findings, exhibit A, “the existing vacation rentals within close proximity have been operating . . . without any code enforcement cases [or] complaints” does not suggest that the ordinance related to location limitations should be disregarded. It may mean that the ordinance is effective!

[4] The North Coast Advisory Council recommended that this minor use permit not be approved.

Marine Terrace is unique for its mix of residential and open space. Let's work together to preserve the beauty and serenity of this environment. The ordinances that have been laboriously constructed must be implemented.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Preciado

To: Cody Scheel, County Planner, cscheel@co.slo.ca.us
FR: John Lamb, j.lamb2@icloud.com
RE: DRC2014-00158 Bailey, Coastal Referral, MUP, Cambria
DT: September 16, 2015

Please forward to Hearing Officer for September 18, 2015 hearing on DRC2014-00158 Bailey

I urge the Hearing Officer to deny to the Minor Use Permit in this matter for the following reasons:

The Bailey MUP should be denied because no unique circumstances support its approval

At the April, 2003 Coastal Commission hearing on the proposed Vacation Rental Ordinance, the Planning Department proposed the original 200 foot limitation and the MUP exception. The 200 foot limitation was intended to limit density of vacation rentals in residential neighborhoods. The MUP exception was intended to allow for "adjustments" to the 200 foot limit.

Several Commissioners expressed concern that the exception undermined the 200 foot limit and made it meaningless. Planning Department staff person John Euphrat explained that this concern was not warranted. He stated:

"You know, we thought this [the MUP exception] might be a good way for *unique circumstances* that we can't anticipate today, to actually deal with those where it does provide visitor serving uses." [See attached copy of transcript. Italics added.]

That was the Commission's understanding when they voted to approve the proposed ordinance.

No unique circumstances have been shown here to justify abandoning the Ordinance's density limitation. The two vacation rentals that already exist within the 150/200 foot limitation adequately provide for "visitor serving uses."

The Bailey MUP should be denied because it would allow an incompatible use in an SFR area

One of the purposes of the MUP is to "insure the proper integration into the community of land uses which, because of their type or intensity, may only be appropriate on particular sites" [23.02.033.]

The Board of Supervisors has recognized that vacation rentals can be incompatible with SFR uses, especially when they are concentrated in the same area. [23.08.165(a).]

If the MUP is approved in this case, three vacation rentals would be concentrated within an 85 foot radius. Such a concentration of vacation rentals in such a small area is not consistent with the "proper integration" standard.

In addition, approving the MUP runs counter to the goals of the North Coast Area Plan. The Plan calls for:

"Protecting residential areas from incompatible uses and protecting the residential character of single-family areas." [page 1-4.]

"Preserving desirable neighborhood characteristics such as compatible uses"

[page 1-4.]

“Balancing carefully the needs of visitors with those of the local residents.” [page 1-7.]

The Ordinance’s density limitation adequately protects these goals. The density limitation also helps achieve the Ordinance’s purpose, which is to ensure that vacation rentals will be compatible with surrounding residential uses. [23.08.165(a).] The density standard should be applied here, and the MUP should be denied.

The Bailey MUP should be denied because it raises traffic and noise concerns

The staff report makes much of the fact that the proposed vacation rental is surrounded on three sides by a vacant lot and existing roads, which the report concludes, “act as buffers reducing possible impacts from the proposed vacation rental to other neighboring properties.” [Attachment 1, G.]

At their July 14, 2011 hearing on amendments to the Vacation Rental Ordinance, the Planning Commissioners agreed on the current 200 linear foot/150 foot radius distance limitation for Cambria. As explained at that time, the 200 linear foot standard was meant to reduce traffic associated with vacation rentals, and the 150 foot radius was meant to reduce the effect of noise on neighboring properties.

The Bailey property sits at the corner of Drake Street and Windsor Boulevard in Cambria’s Marine Terrace. Windsor Boulevard is a major thoroughfare to access the Fiscalini Ranch Preserve’s Windsor gate. Drake Street is a major thoroughfare connecting the Terrace with Ardath Drive and Highway 1. Both streets generate a significant amount of traffic.

Adding a third vacation rental to this end of Drake Street can only increase traffic on both streets, and pose increased risk to wildlife and the many pedestrians who walk the Terrace. As it is, many drivers, especially tourists, drive too fast on these streets.

The Planning Commission concluded that a 150 foot radius is necessary to buffer noise from vacation rentals. The staff report notes that the two existing vacation rentals are within 85 feet of the proposed vacation rental. It does not note that at least eight single family residences are located within a 150 foot radius of the proposed vacation rental. It is an unfortunate fact, but true, that some vacation renters are noisy, and that enforcement cannot always be counted on. It is not fair to the existing single family residences to subject them to this potential for noise that they cannot control.

I urge the Hearing Officer to deny the Minor Use Permit for the foregoing reasons.

Thank you for considering these views.

John Lamb
1841 Ogden Drive
Cambria, CA 93428
805-927-4640

Attachment: Transcript of Coastal Commission hearing, April 11, 2003 (2 pages)

1 State of California

2 Coastal Commission

3
4
5
6 SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY)

7 LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM)

8 COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO)

Major Amendment No. 1-01 A
(Vacation Rentals)

9
10
11
12
13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

14
15
16 Friday

17 April 11, 2003

18 Agenda Item No. 18a

19
20
21
22 Radisson Santa Barbara
23 1111 E. Cabrillo Boulevard
24 Santa Barbara, California
25

1 Reilly: Mr. Euphrat, do you want to address that issue.

2

3 Euphrat: Sure. John Euphrat, Planning Staff. It
4 actually...the minor use permit, it sounds innocuous, but it
5 really isn't. I mean, it's actually a complete public
6 hearing. There would be notification of all property owners
7 within 300 feet, and of course, the Coastal Act requires all
8 tenants within a hundred feet, so there'd be full public
9 disclosure. You know, we thought this might be a good way
10 for unique circumstances that we can't anticipate today, to
11 actually deal with those where it does provide visitor
12 serving uses. We've also committed to your commission that
13 we're going to review this ordinance within two years and
14 see how it's going, and if we're flooded with coastal
15 permits, look at the waivers, we'll reexamine the issue, but
16 we think it could work.

17

18 Reilly: Does that answer your question, Commissioner?

19

20 Durazzo: Yes. I have one more question. A point was made
21 earlier about the number, what is currently in operation,
22 the number that is currently in operation, that there
23 isn't...the information isn't there. How would we identify
24 those that are currently in operation? Could you...?

25

Euphrat: We would probably use a variety of sources, but



Fw: BAILEY VACATION RENTAL WAIVER
Cody Scheel to: Nicole Retana

09/16/2015 03:51 PM

FYI: Thanks,

Cody Scheel
County Planner - Current Planning

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 781-5157
cscheel@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Cody Scheel/Planning/COSLO on 09/16/2015 03:50 PM -----

From: Mary <webb.mary599@gmail.com>
To: Cody Scheel <cscheel@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 09/16/2015 03:49 PM
Subject: BAILEY VACATION RENTAL WAIVER

Please forward to hearing officer for DRC2014-00158, Friday Sept. 18th.

I would like to register my opposition to giving any kind of waiver which would allow Vacation Rentals to be located within the 200 or 150 foot radius of another rental.

Public comments have been made over the past decades showing that residences do not want multiple Vacation Rentals so close together. We also have no regulation of the popular Air BnB sites so we also have no idea just how many rooms, homes or couches are being rented out day by day.

Along with other residents of Cambria, I oppose granting a Minor Use Permit for 313 Drake, to operate a vacation rental business because:

1. There are already 2 licensed vacations rentals nearby, while only 1 would be allowed under the VR ordinance.
2. There is no regulation of the new Air BnB Sites. It is estimated there are 300 listings in Cambria for unregulated Air BnB rentals.
3. The only effective way to mitigate disturbances to the neighborhood is to honor the location limitations of the VR Ordinance.
4. The North Coast Advisory Council, after considering local input, recommended that this Minor Use Permit not be approved.
5. Lack of enforcement and police presence is a serious issue in Cambria.
6. Public comments should not be ignored. Years of public comments have been made leading to the regulations we have today.
7. Parking is a serious concern all over Cambria - having cars parked on both sides of the streets with parties and gatherings is dangerous.
8. Water use is a serious concern for Cambrians. Vacation Rentals use more water and visitors aren't fully informed of our restrictions on water use.
9. Waivers are not good public policy and show a disrespect for good planning.

Please do not allow this waiver.

Thank You,
Mary Webb
1186 Hartford
Cambria, CA 93428